

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit no new matter is presented herein.

Entry of Response is Proper

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 55-086361 to Chiaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,557,239 to Takahashi et al. (Takahashi). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiaki in view of Takahashi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,972,499 to Emoto. Although the Office Action indicates it is Claim 5 that is rejected, in view of the stated basis for the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that it is actually Claim 6 which is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiaki in view of Takahashi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,127,764 to Torok.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the following reason(s).

Claim 1 recites a rotor for a permanent magnet type motor, including a rotor yoke having a stacked structure; a permanent magnet connected on an outer radial peripheral surface of the rotor yoke; and a metal film which is disposed between the rotor yoke and the permanent magnet, wherein the rotor yoke and the permanent magnet are subjected to beam welding at least a portion of a periphery of a contact surface between the permanent magnet and the rotor yoke. Because the welded portion does not include an entire contact surface between the magnet and the rotor yoke, but rather only includes a portion of the contact surface therebetween, the ability to withstand thermal shock is improved. Also, the stacked structure of the rotor and the recited connection of the magnet to the rotor produce a strong connection bond between the magnet and rotor yoke.

Applicants respectfully submit that Chiaki, Takahashi, Emoto and Torok, either alone or in any combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features recited by Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Chiaki discloses connecting a rotor and a permanent magnet using heat compression welding over a relatively large surface area, but still does not disclose beam welding in any technique. More important, however, is the fact that Chiaki does not disclose the magnet (4) being connected to an outer radial peripheral surface of the rotor yoke (6). Rather, Chiaki clearly discloses the magnet (4) being connected to an axial end surface of the rotor yoke (6). See Figures 4-5 of Chiaki, which clearly show the magnet (4) being joined to the axial end of the rotor yoke (6) and not the outer **radial peripheral** surface of the rotor yoke (6).

Takahashi discloses welding of a stator, but does not disclose connecting a rotor and a permanent magnet. Moreover, Takahashi merely discloses welding of an electrical conductor. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Takahashi does not overcome or otherwise address the above described deficiencies of Chiaki.

Emoto is cited for teaching a motor structure wherein the metal film has a particular nickel composition. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Emoto, like Takahashi, does not overcome the above described deficiencies of Chiaki.

Torok is cited for teaching a motor structure wherein the rotor yoke has a stacked structure. Therefore, Torok, like Takahashi and Emoto, does not overcome the above described deficiencies of Chiaki.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, each and every feature of a rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the prior art of record. See M.P.E.P. §2143.03.

Because Chiaki, Takahashi, Emoto and Torok, alone or in any combination thereof, do not teach or suggest all features of Claim 1 and therefore do not derive the benefits flowing therefrom as does the invention recited by Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references and therefore, Claim 1 should be allowable.

Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims should also be deemed allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants request withdrawal of all of the rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the rejections, allowance of Claim 1-6, and the prompt issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 108421-00122.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX LLP



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000
MO/elp